

Appl. No. 09/807,968  
Amendment dated Oct. 14, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 14, 2003

### **REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

In the specification the noted paragraph has been amended to remove that portion of the text objected to by the Examiner as being new matter. Applicant's position is that the added material was not new matter nor evidence of concealment of best mode, but merely provided alternate, or clarifying, language as to applicant's use of "turned down" in the text and figures as filed. In any event, only the original term "turned down" will continue to be used.

In fig. 3 has been amended to replace the lowermost numeral 70 with 72, as indicated in the office action.

Claims 14-18 remain in the application, and Applicant notes that they were not rejected based on the prior art. The Examiner's objections for those claims, based on 35 USC 112, have been addressed above and as follows:

In claim 14, lines 19+, the phrase "said shear bolt being removable ..." has been amended. Support should be apparent from a reading and understanding of the specification as a whole, and in particular from the text at page 2, lines 4-5.

In claim 14, line 15, language has been added to clarify that the "slots" are those from lines 3 & 7;

In claims 16 & 17, the term "turned down" is now used in place of "radially inwardly curved";

In claim 18, line 3, it is clarified that the shear bolt can slideably engage "any one of said slots".

It is submitted that the above changes place claim 14-18 in an allowable format.

New dependent claims 19 and 20 have been added and should be allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this application.

Appl. No. 09/807,968  
Amendment dated Oct. 14, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 14, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICIAL



By:

Thomas E. Malyszko  
Reg. No. 39,466  
Tel.: (403) 540-3204  
Date: October 14, 2003

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 15 2003